

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION



Consultation and Coordination

back of divider—blank page

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Throughout the planning process, the planning team gathered public input on issues, proposed actions and alternatives, and on draft documents. The scoping process included meetings, public workshops, Advisory Commission meetings, newsletters, and the development of a homepage. These were used to identify the issues, alternatives, and impact topics to be considered for planning and to keep the public informed and involved throughout the planning process.

PUBLIC SCOPING AND ALTERNATIVES WORKSHOPS

On August 31, 1995, a public notice describing the purpose of the planning effort was sent to the public, media, agencies, and other organizations on the Bureau of Land Management California Desert District's mailing list. The schedule for the first round of public meetings was included in the notice. On September 5, 1995, a notice of intent announcing the beginning of the planning process and environmental impact statement was published in the *Federal Register*.

Initial public scoping workshops were held from September 21 through 27, 1995 at 10 locations throughout the planning area and in nearby areas where users live. These workshops were held in Pasadena, San Bernardino, Barstow, Baker, Needles, Ridgecrest, Independence, Lone Pine, and Furnace Creek, California, and in Las Vegas, Nevada. About 250 people attended the workshops. These workshops were used to identify issues and concerns that the team should address in preparing a management plan for the area. Detailed notes taken during the workshops were summarized and placed in a notebook for the team's reference.

In late February 1997, a second notice was sent out to inform the public that there would be a second round of workshops in April. A press release was mailed to local media in and near the planning area. Some local newspapers and radio stations informed the public about the workshops. The schedule for these workshops was included in this notice and on the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort homepage. Ten public workshops were held from April 14 through 24, 1997 at Las Vegas, Nevada, Needles, Furnace Creek, Bishop, Lone Pine, Barstow, Pasadena, San Bernardino, Baker, and Ridgecrest, California. Each workshop began with a 20-minute presentation about the planning effort given by Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort team leader Dennis Schramm. After the presentation the team would set up three stations for natural resources, cultural resources, land use, and visitor experience. At these stations, the team gathered comments and alternatives suggested by the public and wrote them down on the flipcharts. This information was utilized, along with information from agency staff and Advisory Commission meetings, to generate alternatives for the draft environmental impact statement. About 330 people attended the workshops.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

In September 1998, Mojave National Preserve released its first *Draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan (DEIS/GMP)*. A notice of availability was published in the *Federal Register* by the Environmental Protection Agency on September 11, 1998 (FR 48727). Public review occurred from September 11, 1998 through January 15, 1999, a period of 127 days. Eleven additional public workshops were held in October 1998 throughout the planning region of southern California and southern Nevada. At these meetings a form was provided for the public to write specific comments that they desired to be addressed by the planning team. In addition, the planning team attended and participated in numerous meetings of the Mojave Advisory Commission to obtain their feedback, concerns, and direction regarding the development of the general management plan.

Approximately 450 printed copies of the 1998 draft plan were distributed for review. In addition, about 100 CD-ROMs containing both 1998 draft plans for Mojave and Death Valley were also sent. The 1998 draft plan was also posted on the Internet with links from the park's homepage and the Northern and Eastern Mojave planning page. Appendix A in volume 2 is a list of agencies, organizations and individuals who were sent copies of the plan.

COMMENTS ON THE 1998 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Mojave received approximately 400 comment letters from government agencies, tribes, interest groups, organizations, and individuals on the 1998 DEIS/GMP. In addition, members of three environmental groups (National Parks and Conservation Association, The Sierra Club, and The Wilderness Society) sent in approximately 1,800 identical postcards. Several additional letters and postcards were received after the closing date for public comments. All written comments are on file at park headquarters.

The Environmental Protection Agency assigned a rating of "LO" (lack of objections) to the *1998 Draft Environmental Impact Statement* and commended the National Park Service for its commitment to preserve and protect surface and groundwater resources and commitment to implement the desert tortoise recovery plan.

Agencies are directed to respond to substantive public comments received during the comment period on draft environmental impact statements (DEIS). Comments are considered substantive when they: a) question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the DEIS, b) question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of the environmental analysis, c) present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the DEIS, or d) cause changes or revisions in the proposal. Comments that state a preference for one alternative (or component of an alternative), state opinions, or are outside the scope of the plan, are not considered substantive and responses are not provided. However, all letters are read and considered. Substantive comments were addressed by means of written responses, and where appropriate, by revisions to the text of the *1998 Draft Environmental Impact Statement* in this *Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement*.

Largely due to public comments, substantial changes were made to the 1998 DEIS/GMP. Consequently, the National Park Service prepared a revised DEIS/GMP to address concerns raised and to solicit additional public review on the changes. Although not required, the NPS also chose to provide responses to the comments received on the 1998 DEIS/GMP in an attempt to clarify issues, address inaccuracies, and provide responses to questions raised on the 1998 DEIS/GMP. See the *Comments and Responses to the 1998 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan* document.

NEWSLETTERS AND HOMEPAGE

The first newsletter in February 1996 was sent to about 6,000 names on the Bureau of Land Management mailing list for the California desert. It included a summary of planning issues identified at the public meetings and statements of purpose and significance for Death Valley National Park, Mojave National Preserve, and BLM-managed lands within the planning area.

The original mailing list was replaced with a planning project mailing list developed from agency lists and scoping participation. A second newsletter was sent to about 500 names on the Northern and

Eastern Mojave Planning Effort mailing list in March 1997. It contained a planning update, the schedule of the workshops, general descriptions of conceptual alternatives, and an outline of issues for which alternatives could be developed. The newsletter was also posted on the homepage. Both newsletters included a one-page mailback for receiving comments.

In February 1997, a homepage for the three California desert planning efforts (West Mojave, Northern and Eastern Colorado, and Northern and Eastern Mojave) went online on the BLM California server. It contained detailed information about each planning effort, background information about the Mojave Desert, and the desert tortoise, pertinent legislation and maps and photographs. In April 1998 the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort homepage was moved to the NPS server so that the planning team would have direct access. The link to this homepage is found in Mojave National Preserve's homepage (www.nps.gov/moja/planning/nemo.htm).

A third newsletter was sent out to the public in April 1998 to update readers on the planning effort. The newsletter explained that three separate draft environmental impact statements for each area (Mojave National Preserve, Death Valley National Park, and the BLM public lands within the Northern and Eastern Mojave planning area) would be produced instead of one comprehensive draft environmental impact statement. A revised planning schedule and comment form for receiving the documents were also provided in the newsletter.

A one page update along with a response form was mailed to about 3,600 names on the mailing list in February 2000. This update served to inform those individuals and agencies of our current status and our intent to prepare a revised draft environmental impact statement. It also requested return of a form identifying interest and desire for a copy of the revised DEIS.

AGENCY CONSULTATION

An interagency meeting was held on August 23, 1995, to discuss the issues to be addressed in this planning effort. The meeting was attended by 43 staff from the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The California state historic preservation officer was formally notified by letter in April 1996 of the planning effort. A response letter offering suggestions was received from the state historic preservation officer in May 1996. A planning team member met briefly with the state historic preservation officer in June 1996 and offered a briefing on the planning effort. No date for the briefing was confirmed. The team will attempt to brief this office following release of the revised DEIS.

Following the public scoping workshops in April 1997, a two-day interagency meeting was held in Barstow, California to discuss the alternatives and comments heard at the workshops. Twenty-eight staff members from the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California State Parks, and San Bernardino County attended the two-day meeting. Comments were gathered on the first day and alternatives were developed on the second day.

An interagency meeting was held on April 10, 1997 to discuss listed and sensitive species in the planning area. It was decided that the team would plan for listed and sensitive species based on habitat types. A follow-up meeting was held on June 11, 1997, to continue the discussion. Habitat types were ranked according to priority, and tasks were assigned to staff members to gather information needed to map the habitats with the highest priority.

On November 12, 1997, the planning team met with Preserve staff to discuss alternatives to be included in the agency review draft plan. The following day, the planning team met with Death Valley staff to discuss alternatives for Death Valley.

Copies of the first internal agency combined draft plan were provided to the Environmental Protection Agency in San Francisco. Copies of the separate draft plans for each park unit were offered for review, but the Environmental Protection Agency declined, opting instead to review and comment on the public draft plans.

Since the decision to issue a revised DEIS was made, numerous meetings have been held with the BLM, USFWS, USGS tortoise biologists and a CDF&G biologist regarding the management strategies for cattle grazing and desert tortoise conservation.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

On April 23, 1996, Dennis Schramm and BLM archeologist Rolla Queen met with the chairmen and tribal members of the Chemehuevi tribe at their reservation on the Colorado River. A follow up meeting was held with the Chemehuevi on May 19, 1997 at their office. An initial meeting with the Ft. Mohave Indian Tribe chairperson also was held on May 19, 1997 at their offices in Needles. The purpose of these meetings was to initiate government-to-government relationships for the planning effort. The tribes were briefed on the scope and status of the planning effort and discussed issues.

INTERTRIBAL MEETING

An intertribal meeting of the Fort Mohave, Timbisha Shoshone, Chemehuevi, and San Manuel tribes was held on July 11, 1997 at the Fort Mohave Reservation's Avi Hotel and Casino in the Laughlin, Nevada area. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss Native American issues and alternatives. Invitation letters were sent to 13 tribal offices and to NPS and BLM staff. Seven representatives for the tribes and nine agency staff attended the meeting. Mr. William "Bill" Mungary (an intertribal leader) facilitated the meeting.

The meeting began with an introduction and greeting by Mr. Mungary followed by an overview of the planning effort by Team Leader Dennis Schramm. Then at their request, the tribes met for an hour and a half without the presence of the agencies. This was then followed by a three-hour discussion between the tribes and agencies which was focused on protection of cultural sites and access to these sites. The tribal representatives also addressed how they would want further consultation to be handled.

MOJAVE NATIONAL PRESERVE ADVISORY COMMISSION

As mandated by the California Desert Protection Act, an advisory commission for Mojave National Preserve was appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The commission was appointed in April 1996. The role of the commission is to advise the Superintendent on planning issues.

The commission held its first meeting in the Preserve on June 12 and 13, 1996. On the first day, the commission visited Kelso Depot then discussed the status of the historic resources report being prepared by the NPS Denver Service Center. The next day included a discussion of administrative procedures for Advisory Commissions and the approved commission charter, an overview of the Federal Advisory Commission Act and a review of the planning objectives, status and issues.

The commission met again at the Hole-in-the-Wall ranger station on September 11 and 12, 1996. On the first day, speakers presented information on burros. This was followed by public input and discussion of alternatives by the commission. Day two involved a 4WD tour of 20 miles of the Mojave Road. During the tour, Dennis Casebier, a commission member, provided a history of the road through use of park radios. Afterwards, the commission visited Zzyzx and discussed management options.

On March 10 and 11, 1997, the commission met in Laughlin, Nevada. Mojave National Preserve Superintendent Mary Martin gave an update on the Preserve's status and Northern and planning team leader Dennis Schramm gave an update on the planning effort's status. Ross Haley, an NPS Wildlife Biologist, presented information on burro census, which was then followed by a comment period. On the second day, Dennis Schramm explained the process of general management plan alternatives development. A wilderness sub-group was also formed.

The commission met again July 19, 1997 at the Hole-in-the-Wall ranger station. This time the public was also invited. The main discussion issues were grazing, the desert tortoise, and gateway communities.

On October 9 and 10, 1997, the commission met at Nipton to discuss desert tortoise issues. Speakers included representatives from Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management California Desert District, as well as consultants and researchers.

On February 19, 1998, the planning team provided an overview of natural resources alternatives to the commission. A follow up meeting was held on March 23, 1998 in Baker to finish the overview of the general management plan.

Three additional meetings of the Advisory Commission have been held at which a briefing on the status of the general management plan and DEIS was provided. At the most recent meeting in January 2000, the Commission was briefed on the changes being made to the DEIS. New alternatives regarding grazing in desert tortoise habitat were discussed.

INVITED COOPERATING AGENCIES

At the initiation of the Northern and Eastern Mojave planning effort a letter was sent to the following agencies advising them of the planning scope and purpose, and inviting their participation as cooperators, or to designate a planning contact. Those marked with an asterisk designated a planning contact.

FEDERAL:

Bureau of Indian Affairs*
Ft. Irwin Army National Training Center*
China Lake Naval Weapons Center
Army Corp of Engineers
Environmental Protection Agency
Inyo National Forest

STATE:

California Department of Fish and Game
California State Parks
California Department of Transportation*
State Lands Commission
California State Historic Preservation Office*
Nevada State Historic Preservation Office

LOCAL:

San Bernardino County, CA*
Inyo County, CA*
Mono County, CA
Clark County, NV*
Nye County, NV
Esmeralda County, NV

NATIVE AMERICAN:

Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Council*
Fort Mohave Tribal Council
Chemehuevi Tribal Council

LIST OF AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE DRAFT PLAN WERE SENT

Federal Agencies

Department of Agriculture

Natural Resource Conservation Service, Mojave District

Department of the Army

Army Corp of Engineers, Los Angeles District

Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District

Department of Defense

China Lake Naval Weapons Station

National Training Center, Ft. Irwin

Department of the Interior

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Sacramento

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Southern California Agency, Riverside

Bureau of Land Management, Desert District, Riverside

Bureau of Land Management, State Office, Sacramento

Bureau of Land Management, Barstow Field Office

Bureau of Land Management, Needles Field Office

Bureau of Land Management, Ridgecrest Field Office

Bureau of Land Management, Las Vegas Field Office

Fish and Wildlife Service, Field Office, Ventura

National Park Service, Death Valley National Park

National Park Service, Denali National Park

National Park Service, Denver Service Center

National Park Service, Joshua Tree National Park

National Park Service, Lake Mead National Recreation Area

National Park Service, Mojave National Preserve

National Park Service, Pacific West Region

National Park Service, Sequoia/Kings Canyon National Park

National Park Service, Washington, D.C. Office

National Park Service, Water Resources Division

U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, Colorado Plateau Field Station

U.S. Geological Survey, Canyon Crest Field Station

Eastern Sierra Interagency Visitor Center

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

U.S. Forest Service, Inyo National Forest

Federal Advisory Groups

Mojave National Preserve Advisory Commission

Elected Officials

U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer, California

U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein, California

Consultation and Coordination

U.S. Representative Jerry Lewis, California
U.S. Senator Richard Bryan, Nevada
U.S. Representative Shelley Berkeley, Nevada
U.S. Representative Jim Gibbons, Nevada
U.S. Senator Harry Reid, Nevada
Governor Gray Davis, California

State Agencies

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Parks and Recreation
California Department of Transportation, District 8
California Department of Transportation, District 9
California Federation of Mineralogical Society
California State Historic Preservation Officer
California State Lands Commission
California State Parks
California State University, Desert Studies Center
Nevada Division of Minerals
Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer
University of California, Berkeley, Hastings Natural History Reserve
University of California, Granite Mountains Natural Reserve
University of California, Los Angeles

Local Agencies

Baker Community Service District
Big Pine Chamber of Commerce
City of Hesperia
City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering
Clark County Department of Comprehensive Planning
Clark County Department of Parks and Recreation
California Deserts Tourism Association
Death Valley Chamber of Commerce
Esmeralda County Board of Commissioners
Indian Wells Valley Water District
Inyo County Agricultural Department
Inyo County Board of Supervisors
Inyo County Planning Department
Kern County Board of Supervisors
Mono County Board of Supervisors
Mono County Planning Department
Nye County Department of Natural Resources and Federal Facilities
Nye County Board of Commissioners
Pinon Mesa Middle School
San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors
San Bernardino Association of Governments
Town of Amargosa

Organizations

Access Fund
American Motorcycle Association, District 37
Animal Protection Institute
Barrick Bullfrog Inc.
BLM Lands Foundation
Blue Ribbon Coalition
Boulder City Gem Club
California Association of Four Wheel Drive Clubs
California Deserts Tourism Association
California Lichen Society
California Off Road Vehicles Association
California State Varmint Callers Association, Inc.
Catellus Development Corp.
Center for Biological Diversity
Center for Environmental Connections
Chatsworth Womens Club
Clark County Gem Collectors
Committee for Responsible Growth
The Conservation Fund
Death Valley 49ers
Death Valley Natural History Association
Desert Survivors
Desert Tortoise Council
Eastern Sierra Audubon Society
Environmental Management Associates
Friends of the Mojave Road
F.M. Myrick Association
Gear Grinders
Genesis Gold Corporation
Gold Searchers
Hacienda De Los Melagros
High Desert Gold Diggers
High Desert Multiple Use Coalition
Las Vegas Gem Club
Lilburn Corporation
Molycorp, Inc.
National Parks and Conservation Association
Natural Resources Defense Council
Needles Gem and Mineral
OMYA
Pahrump Public Lands Advisory
People For the USA
Ponderosa Dairy
Public Lands Council
Public Lands for the People
Rainforest Action Network
Recon
Red Rock Audubon
Restore: The North Woods

Consultation and Coordination

Sage Associates
Saline Preservation Association
The Sierra Club
The Sierra Club-Angeles Chapter
Society for the Conservation of Bighorn Sheep
Southwest Forest Alliance
Tierra Del Sol Four Wheel Drive Club of San Diego
United Four Wheelers Association
U.S. Borax, Inc.
Western Arctic National Parkland
Western Game Alliance
Wild Burro Rescue and Preservation Project
The Wilderness Society
Wilderness Watch

Tribal Governments

Ahamakan Culture Society
Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Colorado River Tribe
Fort Mohave Tribal Council
Pascua Yaqui Tribal Council
Timbisha Shoshone Tribe

Libraries

Amargosa Valley Public Library
Angeles Mesa Library
Balboa Library
Beatty Library
Boulder City Library
California State University, Long Beach Library
California State University, Northridge, Oviatt Library
Clark County Library
Henderson Public Library
Inyo County Free Library, Bishop
Inyo County Free Library, Death Valley Branch
Inyo County Free Library, Lone Pine
Las Vegas Public Library
Mohave County Library
Napa City County Library
Pahrump Library
Pasadena Public Library
Ridgecrest Library
Sacramento Central Library
San Bernardino County Library, Administration
San Bernardino County Library, Barstow Branch
San Bernardino County Library, Needles Branch
San Bernardino County Library, Victorville Branch
San Francisco Public Library, Civic Center
Seattle Public Library

Shasta County Library
Sunrise Public Library
University of Arizona Main Library
University of California, Irvine, Main Library
University of California, Davis, Shields Library
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, James R. Dickinson Library

A total of about 400 individuals received either printed or CD-ROM versions of the plan in the mail. The plan is also posted on the internet.

